

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 28, 2006

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I support final passage of this pension legislation because we must do something today to protect working families so that the pension promises that were made to them are honored. I am proud today to stand with the employees and groups who are in support of this legislation, including the Affiliated Unions of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, International Association of Machinists, UNITE/HERE, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and many others. And, I join with all of my Republican and Democratic colleagues from the Minnesota delegation in broad bipartisan support for this bill.

Without this legislation, Northwest Airlines, a major Minnesota-based employer and key player in the economic vitality of the region, will not be able to come out of bankruptcy with its pension plans intact. I support this legislation because it will help to ensure Northwest Airlines keeps flying and that their employees can keep working and ensure that their pensions are funded.

This bill is not perfect. In addition to much needed relief for airline employees, this bill includes provisions that will make it easier for working families to save for their retirements by encouraging automatic enrollment in retirement savings. It is critical that families are supported in their efforts to create a strong foundation of savings for their futures.

Working men and women have waited far too long for Congress to pass legislation to protect pension benefits and to honor the promise of pensions. Pension legislation should have been done many months ago. This Congress's failure to act in a more timely way will potentially make worse current and future employer bankruptcies and will impact the strength of all retirement benefits. It is shameful that this Republican Congress has put partisan politics ahead of the well-being of working men and women and those who have already retired.

I am concerned that this pension bill before us today has been introduced with no notice and there has been no opportunity for Members to review the provisions. Instead of bringing forward the bill that Congress has been working on now for more than a year, House Republicans have brought this bill forward.

It is outrageous that House Democrats were excluded in the conference committee negotiations between the House and the Senate. After missing three deadlines to complete their work, House Republicans, instead, were more interested in thinking of ways to attach their extreme tax cuts for America's wealthiest onto what should have been clean, common sense, bipartisan legislation. Their tactics were so ex-

treme that their colleagues in the Senate were unwilling to go along with it. So, here we are now at the eleventh hour doing what we can to salvage pension legislation.

Today, I wish I were rising to support passage of a bill that will guarantee quick action to save the pensions of millions of workers, but instead, once again, partisan politics will slow down the much needed action on pension reform. Even with House passage of the bill, we can't guarantee anything to America's workers because this legislation was taken from the conference committee and now it must pass the Senate with no changes in order for it to move to the President's desk for his approval. If the Senate wants to change anything in the bill, American workers will have to continue to wait for Congress to act.

I do share some of the concerns expressed by my colleagues. There are some missed opportunities—including the failure to address executive compensation and provisions concerning the investment advice for those who have 401(K) plans and IRAS. The investment advice exemptions in the bill do not adequately protect against conflicted investment advice.

Despite some legitimate reservations voiced by groups I respect, this bill contains good provisions—important provisions that must be passed now so that employers can keep the pension promises made to their employees.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 503—TO AMEND THE HORSE PROTECTION ACT TO PROHIBIT THE SHIPPING, TRANSPORTING, MOVING, DELIVERING, RECEIVING, POSSESSING, PURCHASING, SELLING, OR DONATION OF HORSES AND OTHER EQUINES TO BE SLAUGHTERED FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. DAVID DRIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 2006

Mr. DRIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has announced that it may meet the week of September 4th to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of the bill H.R. 503, to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Rules Committee in room H-312 of the Capitol by 11 a.m. on Wednesday, September 6, 2006. A copy of the form used for submitting amendments to the Rules Committee is on the back of this letter. Mem-

bers should draft their amendments to the bill as introduced on February 1, 2005.

Members are also encouraged to submit an electronic copy of the amendment either via the committee's web page (http://www.rules.house.gov/amendment_form.asp) or by e-mailing an electronic copy of the amendment to rules.amendments@mail.house.gov. Anyone e-mailing an electronic copy of an amendment should include the bill number and amendment sponsor in the subject of the e-mail, as well as a copy of the summary in the body of the e-mail. Electronic submission of an amendment does not relieve a Member of filing the amendment with the committee as explained above.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House. If you have any questions, please contact me or George Rogers at extension 5-9191.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 2006

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record my rollcall votes 421-423.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on votes 421 and 423.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on vote 422.

HONORING FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS THOMAS J. MANTON

SPEECH OF

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 2006

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my sentiments to the words that have been spoken already. I associate myself with the remarks that have been made about Tom Manton.

Tom Manton was a political leader in an adjacent county, the Borough of Queens. In the Borough of Brooklyn we had what we call a first-rate political machine, and in view of the fact that we have been discussing power-sharing and the Voting Rights Act, I remember dramatically seeing the difference between Brooklyn and Queens.

As a leader in Queens, Tom Manton believed in power-sharing. Minorities did not have to fight to get what they deserved in Queens. Harmony was not established only after a big battle was waged and the spoils were settled. In Brooklyn we had to battle for everything. We had to fight all the way.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Tom Manton was a political boss. He was the head of a machine. But he gave new meaning to the word machine and being a boss. A conciliator, a mediator, a guy who made things happen as he took this diverse, rapidly growing borough; rapidly growing in terms of diverse population, and he wove it all together without bitter fights and without leaving a lot of blood in the aisles.

So I take my hat off to Tom Manton and the kind of example he set. Several of my colleagues have said that Tom embodied "the American dream." Yes, he did. But the totality of his achievements cannot be contained in even that sought-after tribute. This ordinary American with his extraordinary ability to appeal to the best parts of human nature gifted Ireland, the land of his ancestors, with a lasting peace by facilitating the Good Friday Accords. Throughout his life Tom encouraged political solutions to contentious issues—not violence, fear or isolation.

Tom Manton fought hard for his constituents, often greasing the wheels of the bureaucracy to help them out. Elected officials and public leaders also received his invaluable support and guidance. He shared a workingman's outlook because he was a workingman: a policeman, a salesman, and Marine. He cared for the environment and recognized that protecting the air and water would protect communities. He was a thinker and a far-sighted activist for a better world.

In Tom's sensible hands, politics might be partisan, but could never be called "dirty." In his capable hands, the New Yorkers who unfailingly voted him into Congress were confident of fair thoughtful representation. They knew—regardless of race, gender, or background—they were welcome at any table where he presided. He had a beautiful vision of what a community should be, a party, a country, a world. He was a loyal friend to many and a much-loved family man. He will be missed, but his life and his contributions will not be forgotten.

HONORING ROSEMARY FOREMAN
IN RETIREMENT

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 2006

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rosemary Foreman, who is retiring after contributing over thirty years of service to the Commonwealth of Virginia and the Republican Party. I have known Rosemary Foreman since my days in the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors when she was a congressional staffer for Congressman Stan Par-
ris.

Rosemary served as the first Community/Outreach Coordinator for the Virginia Attorney General Office's Northern Virginia Regional Office, under Attorneys General Bob McDonnell, Jim Gilmore, Mark Earley, Jerry Kilgore, as well as interim Attorneys General Randy Baeles and Richard Cullen.

In this position, Rosemary leveraged her considerable interpersonal and communications skills to help the Attorney General educate the citizens of Northern Virginia on consumer protection and crime prevention.

Before joining the government of Virginia, Rosemary helped lead a number of political campaigns for state and congressional candidates in Northern Virginia and held political positions in several Congressional offices. Throughout her career, she earned a well-deserved reputation for her political acumen, tenacious advocacy and gracious constituent service.

In the course of developing a valued and impressive record of public and political service, Rosemary was a dedicated and loving wife to her husband E. David Foreman, Jr., and mother to her two children, Sheryl Olecheck and E. David Foreman III.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in applauding Rosemary Foreman and congratulating her on her retirement after a distinguished career dedicated to serving the citizens of Northern Virginia.

UNITED STATES AND INDIA NUCLEAR COOPERATION PROMOTION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 26, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5682) to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 a proposed nuclear agreement for cooperation with India:

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns with the United States and India Nuclear Cooperation Promotion Act of 2006, H.R. 5682. While I intend to vote in support of this legislation, I do so with serious concerns that must be articulated to the Administration.

The President and the State Department failed to seriously consult with Congress prior to announcing this proposed partnership, and therefore left little room for Congress to either voice concern or make any substantial change to the proposed partnership. Without any serious Congressional discussions on the issue, the Administration felt it acceptable to announce last July that it would seek to bypass the global nonproliferation regime that has served to provide international security for decades. The White House's tacit acknowledgement that such a proposition would require legislative approval once again shows how this Administration lacks any respect for the balance of powers enumerated in Constitution, and the principle that Congress is an equal branch of government.

In the face of this serious lapse of judgment on the part of the Administration, the Committee on International Relations should be commended for its bipartisan work undertaken to strengthen this legislation, and improve upon the poor proposal the Administration originally proposed. Chairman HYDE and Ranking Member LANTOS took the serious concerns expressed by many members, both those on the Committee and those not, into consideration to drastically improve the bill now before us, guaranteeing Congress the right to see the agreement prior to final Congressional approval. In addition, India will

open its civilian nuclear facilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency for inspections, and should India perform any weapons tests in the future, all U.S. cooperation would cease, permanently. India must work with the U.S. to conclude a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty as well.

The overarching goal of this legislation, to increase positive diplomatic ties between the U.S. and India, is laudable. India is the world's largest democracy, and is a growing economic and political influence not only in Southeast Asia, but in the greater global community. There is bipartisan agreement that India is a friendly and growing partner of the U.S. in many respects. When India reached out to the United States in the 1960s, seeking partnership and increased friendly relations with us, we rebuffed them. It was a mistake to do so then, and it would be a mistake to do so now and allow an opportunity to warm relations with India to slip by.

However, I have serious concerns that prior to any civil nuclear agreement can move forward, safeguards be in place to ensure that India does not use any of this technology to further its production of nuclear weapons. This legislation fails to ensure that India does not divert its domestic supply of enriched uranium to its weapons program, nor does it place India's military facilities under IAEA inspections, all regrettable. In addition, despite the fact that the five current nuclear weapons states are believed to have suspended the production of fissile material, this proposed agreement does not force India to do the same and operate under these same guidelines.

I am extremely disturbed by recent media reports, however, that the Administration was aware of two Indian firms that had sold missile parts to Iran, but failed to inform Congress prior to this bill being debated before us. The fact that the Administration failed to present to Congress on July 1 a mandated report regarding weapons suppliers to Iran and Syria, is a case of neglect, but the timing of this severe neglect of duty could not have been worse. The Administration, despite its assertions that India has an impeccable nonproliferation record, has deemed it proper to sanction the two companies, but did not feel that it would be prudent for Congress to know this information prior to this vote. This oversight demonstrates a serious lack of judgment on the part of the Administration, and calls into question all given assurances of security safeguards on the proposed nuclear deal. Had this information been available prior to this debate, I believe it would have greatly influenced not only the content of the legislation before us, but the outcome of the vote we are about to take.

I voted in favor of this legislation in Committee, and intend to support, this legislation now, in the hopes that the Administration would continue working to obtain assurances from the Indian government that there will be no transfer of nuclear technology, either deliberate or accidental, to either the Indian weapons program, or to rogue regimes who are attempting to develop weapons of mass destruction. I strongly urge the Administration to urge that all Indian facilities be placed under IAEA inspections, and that the Indian government voluntarily halt the production of fissile material.